

REMARKS

Claims 28-36 were rejected. Claims 28-36 are now pending. The following remarks are considered by Applicants to overcome each rejection raised by the Examiner and to place the application in condition for allowance.

Examiner Interview

A telephonic Examiner Interview was held on October 1, 2008. Applicants contended that the cited references do not disclose "said antenna and said circulator or said HF isolator being arranged in a common housing of the antenna unit" or that the housing "can be plugged in or screwed on such that the antenna unit is replaceable as a unit." Applicants also contended that the Courtney reference was not analogous art.

Regarding the common housing limitation, the Examiner argued that the dashed lines of the flow diagram of Courtney's Figure 2 disclosed a common housing. Regarding the analogous art issue, the Examiner argued that Courtney was in the same field as the invention because they both used wireless transceivers. Applicants disagreed with these positions.

Regarding the replaceable limitation, the Examiner stated that Courtney does not disclose that an antennae unit that "can be plugged in or screwed on such that the antenna unit is replaceable as a unit." The Examiner stated that this distinction could overcome the pending obviousness rejections. Further, the Examiner stated that Applicants' response would not need to be accompanied by an RCE.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected pending independent claims 28, 30, 31, 33, and 35 as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of Courtney (U.S. Pat. No. 6,469,658). The cited AAPA (paragraph 8 of the application publication) discloses "that it is already known for HF circulators, isolators or filters to be fixedly installed in HF transmitters or wireless microphones, which have to be suitably exchanged upon a change in frequency." Courtney discloses a method for generating an electromagnetic environment in which the free field, plane wave response of electronic systems of an electrically large object under test can be measured in the electromagnetic radiating near field of the transmitter array apparatus.

The AAPA and the Courtney reference, however, do not disclose a wireless microphone system "wherein the antenna unit [which comprises a common housing] can be plugged in or

screwed on such that the antenna unit is replaceable as a unit," as required by the pending independent claims. The current Office Action contends that Courtney discloses this limitation at column 7, lines 20-29. This text discloses that certain components of the Courtney system can be replaced, but does not disclose that a common housing (comprising an antenna and circulator or isolator) can be "plugged in or screwed on" to be "replaceable as a unit." During the recent Examiner Interview, the Examiner conceded that the cited references do not disclose that the antennae unit "can be plugged in or screwed on such that the antenna unit is replaceable as a unit." Further, the Examiner stated that this distinction between the invention and the cited references could overcome the pending obviousness rejections.

Applicants also respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose "said antenna and said circulator or said HF isolator being arranged in a common housing," as also required by the pending independent claims. (Support for this common housing limitation can be found at least in original claims 19 and 23, and paragraph 14 of the application publication.) The Examiner contends that the dashed lines of Courtney's Figure 2 disclose that the antenna 36 and the isolator 24 are in a common housing. But there is no support for such a conclusion. Nothing in Courtney indicates that the dashed lines represent a common housing. Further, Figure 2 is a flow diagram. It is not meant to represent the physical structure of the Courtney system.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the invention of independent claims 28, 30, 31, 33, or 35, or their dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the obviousness rejections.

An early action on the merits of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Eugene LeDonne
Reg. No. 35,930
Joseph Miller, II
Reg. No. 61,748

REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10022
(P) 212-521-5400
Attorney for Applicant